



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.				
10/714,634	11/18/2003	Hui-Huang Chang	BHT-3111-379	3258				
7590 02/06/2008								
BRUCE H. TROXELL SUITE 1404 5205 LEESBURG PIKE FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>EXAMINER</td> </tr> <tr> <td>AKHAVANNIK, HADI</td> </tr> </table>			EXAMINER	AKHAVANNIK, HADI		
EXAMINER								
AKHAVANNIK, HADI								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>ART UNIT</td> <td>PAPER NUMBER</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2624</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2624	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER							
2624								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>MAIL DATE</td> <td>DELIVERY MODE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>02/06/2008</td> <td>PAPER</td> </tr> </table>			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	02/06/2008	PAPER
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE							
02/06/2008	PAPER							

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/714,634	Applicant(s) CHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Hadi Akhavannik	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/19/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, with respect to claim 1, the Applicant argues that Fiete does not disclose the interference model as claimed in claim 1. The Examiner notes that independent claim 1 merely recites "establishing an interference model according to the difference". This claim language is broad and Fiete discloses finding the error in the slopes to correct the streaks, see for example figures 4a-4b. The Examiner believes that finding the errors reads on establishing an interference model. Next, the Fiete reference creates a recovery model by determining the correct values of the a_{subx} and b_{subx} as it the system corrects each pixel value in the column using a_{subx} and b_{subx} . So, while the specification of the present invention may function differently from Fiete, the Fiete reference reads on the current claims.

Therefore, the current rejection stands. Please see the final rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-13, and 15-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fiete et al. (588112, referred to as "Fiete" herein).

Regarding claim 1, Fiete discloses a method for building a recovery model, the recovery model being used to reduce a zipper of image data (the examiner notes that the body of the claim never refers back to "zipper of image" and therefore this part of the claim is not given weight. Also, the abstract of Fiete discloses reducing streaks in an image, which the examiner believes reads on "zipper"):

producing a plurality of outputted signals according to a plurality of brightness, wherein the brightness are not all the same (column 3, lines 47 to column 4 line 24 discloses obtaining pixel data of the image. The system calculates the differences between the illumination data);

measuring a plurality of differences according to the outputted signals and a plurality of estimated signals corresponding to the brightness (column 4 line 16 to column 5 line 41 discloses measuring the differences of the pixel data that correspond to the illumination data);

establishing an interference model according to the differences (column 5 line 42 to column 6 line 51 discloses creating an interference model which is used to improve the image quality. The system runs statistical tests to see the quality of the interference model);

and producing the recovery model according to the interference model (column 6 line 52 to column 7 line 40 discloses finalizing the interference model and creating an

recovery model as a result. The recovery model is then used to output a distorted free image).

Regarding claim 2, Fiete discloses producing the recovery model through a mathematic method according to the interference model (column 5 line 47 to column 7 line 34 discloses how the system tests an interference model to see if the statistical results are accurate and then creating a recovery model from the result. The recovery model is then used to create a distorted free image).

Regarding claim 5-6, please see the rejection of claim 1 as it discloses all aspects of claim 5-6. Note that the recovered image is better quality because it has diminished streaks.

Regarding claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 discloses all aspects of claim 7.

Regarding claim 8, the rejection of claim 2 discloses all aspects of claim 8.

Regarding, claim 11, see the rejection of claims 1 and 6. Also note that Fiete discloses a processing logic in columns 3 line 51 to column 5 line 46.

Regarding claim 12, the rejection of claim 7 discloses all aspects of claim 12.

Regarding claim 13, please see the rejection of claim 2 as it discloses all aspects of claim 13.

Regarding claim 15, the rejection of claim 5 discloses all aspects of claim 15.

Regarding claim 16, column 7 line 50 to column 11 line 25 discloses a software program.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3-4, 9-10, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiete in view of Bolin et al. (5751844, referred to as "Bolin" herein).

Regarding claim 3, Fiete discloses all aspects of claim 3 except for using a neural network.

Bolin discloses using a neural network (see figure 15 and column 14 line 28 to column 15 line 7, as it discloses using a neural network to solve for brightness issues in an image).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to include in Fiete a neural network means as taught by Bolin. The reason for the combination is because it makes for a more robust system that is able optimize the brightness distribution of an image by using a common and efficient statistical method. Further, note that both inventions are from the same field of endeavor of image correction.

Regarding claim 4, Bolin discloses that the Neural Network method comprises: setting a tolerance value; inputting a plurality of input data into an initial model; producing an output data from the initial model; modifying the initial model according to a difference of the output data and the input data; and outputting the modified model as

the recovered model (please note that these are standard steps that any neural network must follow. Bolin Column 14 lines 28-45 discloses setting a tolerance value. Column 14 lines 46-58 disclose inputting the data. Column 14 lines 59-65 disclose producing an output based on the correction done by the neural network. And finally, column 14 line 59 to column 15 line 7 disclose outputting the result).

Regarding claim 9, please see the rejection of claim 3 as it discloses all aspects of claim 9.

Regarding claim 10, please see the rejection of claim 4 as it discloses all aspects of claim 10.

Regarding claim 14, the rejection of claim 3 discloses all aspects of claim 14.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number:
10/714,634
Art Unit: 2624


Page 7

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hadi Akhavannik whose telephone number is 571-272-8622. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian P. Werner can be reached on 517-272-7401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HA
1/25/08



BRIAN WERNER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER